

Fluctuations in galaxy counts: a new test for homogeneity versus fractality

A. GABRIELLI^{1,3} AND F. SYLOS LABINI^{2,3}

¹ *Laboratoire de la Physique de la Matière Condensée, École Polytechnique, 91128 - Palaiseau Cedex, France*

² *Dépt. de Physique Théorique, Université de Genève 24, Quai E. Ansermet, CH-1211 Genève, Switzerland*

³ *INFM Sezione di Roma1, Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza" - P.le A. Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy*

(received ; accepted)

PACS. 05.20–y – Statistical Mechanics.

PACS. 98.65–r – Large scale structure of the Universe.

Abstract. – Fractal properties are usually characterized by means of various statistical tools which deal with spatial average quantities. Here we focus on the determination of fluctuations around the average counts and we develop a test for the study of galaxy distribution both in redshift and magnitude space. Fluctuations in the counts of galaxies, in a fractal distribution, are of the same order of the average number at all scales as a function of redshift and magnitude. We point out that the study of these kind of fluctuations can be a powerful test to understand the nature of galaxy clustering at very large scales.

We consider the effect of real space long-range correlations in galaxy distribution on the statistical properties of counts both in redshift and in magnitude space. The existence of large scale structures (LSS) and voids in the distribution of galaxies up to several hundreds Megaparsecs is well known for twenty years [1, 2]. The relationship among these structures on the statistics of galaxy distribution is usually inferred by applying the standard statistical analysis as introduced and developed by Peebles and coworkers [3]. Such an analysis *assumes* implicitly that the distribution is homogeneous at very small scale ($\lambda_0 \approx 5 \div 10 h^{-1} Mpc$). Therefore the system is characterized as having small fluctuations about a finite average density. If the galaxy distribution had a fractal nature the situation would be completely different. In this case the average density in finite samples is not a well defined quantity: it is strongly sample-dependent going to zero in the limit of an infinite volume. In such a situation it is not meaningful to study fluctuations around the average density extracted from sample data. The statistical properties of the distribution should then be studied in a completely different framework than the standard one. We have been working on this problem since some time [4] by following the original ideas of Pietronero [5]. The result is that galaxy structures are indeed

fractal up to tens of Megaparsecs [6]. Whether a crossover to homogeneity at a certain scale λ_0 , occurs or not (corresponding to the absence of voids of typical scale larger than λ_0) is still a matter of debate [7]. At present, the problem is basically that the available redshift surveys do not sample scales larger than $50 \div 100 h^{-1} Mpc$ in a wide portion of the sky and in a complete way. In order to clarify this problem in the available galaxy catalogs, we propose here to study fluctuations around the average behavior of galaxy counts in redshift and magnitude space. As a matter of fact, in the counts of galaxies, large fluctuations around the average behavior have been reported by different authors both in redshift [9] and photometric surveys [10, 11]. There have been controversy as to whether they are due to real clustering or to incompleteness of the catalogs [7] or to differences in the magnitude zero point of the various photometric surveys. It is, indeed, possible that discrepancies among these surveys are due mostly not to differences in photometric systems or in data reduction effects, but rather to real effects, i.e. large scale structures. We consider here this possibility and we present specific calculations about the expected value of these fluctuations in three cases: (i) a Poissonian homogeneous distribution, (ii) a purely fractal distribution, and (iii) a homogeneous distribution with scale-invariant (i.e. strongly correlated) fluctuations.

Let $n(\vec{r}) = \sum_i \delta(\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i)$ be the microscopic density of a given set of galaxies. We *assume* hereafter that $\nu(L, \vec{r}) = \phi(L)n(\vec{r})$ is the density of galaxies in the volume element d^3r around the point $\vec{r}$, and with luminosity in the range $[L, L + dL]$. Note that by writing $\nu(L, \vec{r})$ as a product of the space density for the luminosity function, the hypothesis that galaxy positions are independent of galaxy luminosity is implicitly assumed. Although it is known that there is a correlation between galaxy positions and luminosities [12], it has been tested that this is a reasonable assumption in the galaxy catalogs available so far [4, 6]. The galaxy luminosity function usually assumed from observations is the so-called Schechter one: $\phi(L) = AL^\delta \exp(-L/L_*)$. The parameters L_* (luminosity cut-off) and δ (power law index) can be determined experimentally [12]. The constant A is an overall normalizing factor such that the integral of $\phi(L)$ over all luminosities is equal to one. In a volume limited (hereafter VL) sample [4] extracted from a given redshift survey, we may compute the number of galaxies as a function of distance of a fixed galaxy placed at the origin of coordinates. One can write the number-counts in a VL sample with faint luminosity limit at $L = L_{VL}$ and in a sphere $C(R)$ of radius R in real (redshift) space as

$$N(< R; > L_{VL}) = \int_{L_{VL}}^{\infty} dL \phi(L) \int_{C(R)} d^3r n(\vec{r}). \quad (1)$$

We may also consider the integrated galaxy counts as a function of apparent flux (or magnitude), where $f = L/4\pi r^2$ is the apparent flux. In this case one simply have

$$N(> f) = \int_f^{\infty} df' n(f') = \int_0^{\infty} dL \phi(L) \int d^3r n(\vec{r}) \Theta\left(\frac{L}{4\pi r^2} - f\right), \quad (2)$$

where $\Theta(x)$ is the usual step function and the spatial integral is extended to the whole space. We study below average value and fluctuations of $N(< r)$ (Eq.1) and $N(> f)$ (Eq.2) for an homogeneous, a fractal, and an homogeneous distribution with scale-invariant fluctuations.

Before going on, some statistical definitions about averages and correlation functions have to be introduced [3]. Consider a *statistically* homogeneous and isotropic particle density $n(\vec{r})$ with or without correlations with a well defined average value n_0 . Statistical homogeneity and isotropy refer to the fact that any n -point statistical property of the system is a function only on the scalar relative distances between these n points. The existence of a well defined average

density means that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\|C(R)\|} \int_{C(R)} d^3r n(\vec{r}) = n_0 > 0$$

(where $\|C(R)\| \equiv 4\pi R^3/3$ is the volume of the sphere $C(R)$) independently of the origin of coordinates. The scale λ_0 , such that $|\int_{C(R)} d^3r n(\vec{r})/\|C(R)\| - n_0| < n_0$ for $R > \lambda_0$, is usually called *homogeneity scale*. If $n(\vec{r})$ is extracted from a density ensemble, n_0 is considered the same for each realization, i.e. it is a self-averaging quantity. Let $\langle F \rangle$ be the ensemble average of a quantity F related to $n(\vec{r})$. If only one realization of $n(\vec{r})$ is available, $\langle F \rangle$ can be evaluated as an average over *all* the different points (occupied or not) of the space taken as origin of the coordinates. The quantity $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2)...n(\vec{r}_l) \rangle dV_1 dV_2...dV_l$ gives the average probability of finding l particles placed in the infinitesimal volumes $dV_1, dV_2, ..., dV_l$ respectively around $\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, ..., \vec{r}_l$. For this reason $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2)...n(\vec{r}_l) \rangle$ is called *complete l -point correlation function*. Obviously $\langle n(\vec{r}) \rangle = n_0$, and in a single sample such that $V^{1/3} \gg \lambda_0$, it can be estimated by $n_V = N/V$ where N is the total number of particle in volume V .

Let us analyze the auto-correlation properties of such a system. Due to the hypothesis of statistical homogeneity and isotropy, $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle$ depends only on $r_{12} = |\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|$. Moreover, $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2)n(\vec{r}_3) \rangle$ is only a function of $r_{12} = |\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|$, $r_{23} = |\vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_3|$ and $r_{13} = |\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_3|$. The *reduced* two-point and three correlation functions $\xi(r)$ and $\zeta(r_{12}, r_{23}, r_{13})$ are respectively defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle &= n_0^2 [1 + \xi(r_{12})] \\ \langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2)n(\vec{r}_3) \rangle &= n_0^3 [1 + \xi(r_{12}) + \xi(r_{23}) + \xi(r_{13}) + \zeta(r_{12}, r_{23}, r_{13})] \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In order to analyze observations from an occupied point it is necessary to define another kind of average: the *conditional* average $\langle F \rangle_p$. This is defined as an ensemble average with the condition that the origin of coordinates is an occupied point. When only one realization of $n(\vec{r})$ is available, $\langle F \rangle_p$ can be evaluated averaging the quantity F over all the occupied points taken as origin of coordinates. $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2)...n(\vec{r}_l) \rangle_p dV_1 dV_2...dV_l$ is the average probability of finding l particles placed in the infinitesimal volumes $dV_1, dV_2, ..., dV_l$ respectively around $\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, ..., \vec{r}_l$ with the condition that the origin of coordinates is an occupied point. We call $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2)...n(\vec{r}_l) \rangle_p$ conditional l -point density. Applying the rules of conditional probability [13], one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n(\vec{r}) \rangle_p &= \langle n(\vec{0})n(\vec{r}) \rangle / n_0 \\ \langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle_p &= \langle n(\vec{0})n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle / n_0 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

However, in general, the following convention is assumed in the definition of the conditional densities: the particle at the origin does not observe itself. Therefore $\langle n(\vec{r}) \rangle_p$ is defined only for $r > 0$, and $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle_p$ for $r_1, r_2 > 0$. In the following we use this convention as corresponding to the experimental data in galaxy catalogs.

Imposing a partitioning on the space V (in the case $V \rightarrow \infty$) with small cells of volume dV , let us consider the following Poissonian occupation process:

$$n(\vec{r}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{dV} & \text{with probability } n_0 dV \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - n_0 dV \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $dV \ll 1/n_0$ and $\vec{r}$ is the center of dV . No correlation is supposed among different cells. First of all one obtains $\langle n(\vec{r}) \rangle = n_0$ and the homogeneity scale is given by $\lambda_0 = 1/n_0^{1/3}$. The lack of correlations implies $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle = n_0^2$ if $\vec{r}_1 \neq \vec{r}_2$ and $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle = n_0/dV$ if $\vec{r}_1 = \vec{r}_2$. In

the limit $dV \rightarrow 0$ one obtains $\xi(r_{12}) = \delta(\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2)/n_0$. Analogously, one can obtain the three point correlation functions: $\zeta(r_{12}, r_{23}, r_{13}) = \delta(\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2)\delta(\vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_3)/n_0^2$. The two previous relations say only that there is no correlation between different points. That is, the reduced correlation functions ξ and ζ have only the so called “diagonal” part. This diagonal part is present in the reduced correlation functions of any statistically homogeneous and isotropic distribution with correlations. For instance [14] $\xi(r)$ in general can be written as $\xi(r) = \delta(\vec{r})/n_0 + h(r)$, where $h(r)$ is the non-diagonal part which is meaningful only for $r > 0$. In general $h(r)$ is a smooth function of r . As written before, in the definition of conditional densities, we exclude the contribution of the origin of coordinates. Consequently, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n(\vec{r}) \rangle_p &= n_0 \\ \langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle_p &= n_0^2 [1 + \delta(\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2)/n_0] . \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

By using Eq. (1) and Eq. (6), one can compute both the average counts $\langle N(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p$ and the relative fluctuation $\langle \Delta N^2(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p \equiv \langle N^2(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p - \langle N(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p^2$, obtaining:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p &= \frac{4\pi n_0 R^3}{3} \int_{L_{VL}}^{\infty} dL \phi(L) \\ \langle \delta_{VL}^2(R) \rangle_p &\equiv \frac{\langle N^2(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p - \langle N(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p^2}{\langle N(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p^2} \sim R^{-3} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This implies that the typical fluctuations between $N(< R; > L_{VL})$ seen by a single observer and the average over all the possible observers goes to zero with R as $R^{-\frac{3}{2}}$. In an analogous way, using Eq. (2) and Eq. (6), we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N(> f) \rangle_p &= A n_0 \mathcal{C}(L_*, \delta) f^{-\frac{3}{2}} \\ \langle \delta^2(f) \rangle_p &\equiv \frac{\langle N^2(> f) \rangle_p - \langle N(> f) \rangle_p^2}{\langle N(> f) \rangle_p^2} = \frac{\mathcal{C}_2(L_*, \delta)}{\mathcal{C}(L_*, \delta)^2} \frac{1}{n_0} f^{\frac{3}{2}} . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Then for $f \rightarrow 0$ the relative fluctuation of the f -counts from a single observer and the average behavior decreases as $f^{\frac{3}{4}}$. The proportionality constants $\mathcal{C}(L_*, \delta)$ and $\mathcal{C}_2(L_*, \delta)$ can be evaluated by performing explicitly the integrals implied by Eq. (2):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(L_*, \delta) &= 1/(3\sqrt{4\pi}) L_*^{\delta + \frac{5}{2}} \Gamma_e \left(\delta + \frac{5}{2} \right) \\ \mathcal{C}_2(L_*, \delta) &= 4\pi (L_*)^{2\delta + \frac{7}{2}} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dx dx' x^\delta x'^\delta e^{-(x+x')} \int_0^\infty dy y^2 \Theta \left(\sqrt{\frac{x}{4\pi}} - y \right) \Theta \left(\sqrt{\frac{x'}{4\pi}} - y \right) , \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\Gamma_e(x)$ is Euler gamma-function. One can also consider the equivalent result in magnitude space. By definition [8] $f = \frac{L_*}{4\pi(10 \text{ pc})^2} 10^{0.4(M_* - m)} = K \times 10^{-0.4m}$. Then, from Eq.8 one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N(< m) \rangle_p &\sim 10^{0.6m} \\ \langle \delta^2(m) \rangle_p &\equiv \frac{\langle N^2(< m) \rangle_p - \langle N(< m) \rangle_p^2}{\langle N(< m) \rangle_p^2} \sim 10^{-0.6m} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

i.e. the normalized fluctuation exhibit an exponential decrease in m .

Let us consider the fractal case. It is well known that fractal structures with the same fractal dimension may have very different morphological properties. How such properties can be defined and measured in a quantitative way is a very important question. Several

authors have introduced concepts like lacunarity, porosity, log-periodic corrections to scaling and others in order to go beyond the simple scaling analysis. Here we briefly review some useful concepts and definitions. For a fractal point distribution with dimension $D < 3$ the conditional one-point density $\langle n(\vec{r}) \rangle_p$ (which is hereafter called $\Gamma(r)$) has the following behavior [4] $\langle n(\vec{r}) \rangle_p \equiv \Gamma(r) = Br^{D-3}$. Henceforth the average mass-length relation (hereafter MLR) from an occupied point is

$$\langle N(< R) \rangle_p = (4\pi B)/D \times R^D, \quad (11)$$

The constant B is directly related to the lower cut-off of the distribution. Eq.(11) implies that the average density in a sphere of radius R around an occupied point scales as $1/R^{3-D}$. Hence it depends on the sample size R , the fractal is asymptotically empty and thus $\lambda_0 \rightarrow \infty$. The MLR has a genuine power law behavior only when it is averaged over the ensemble, or over all the points of the structure if only one realization is available. The behavior of $N(< R)$ from a single point presents scale invariant oscillations around the average given by Eq.(11). The presence of such oscillations is due to the fact that, at any scale R , the point distribution presents voids of radius of the same order as R . Usually this effect from a single point is described through a *modulation term* $f(R)$ around the average behavior: $N(< R) = (4\pi B)/D \times R^D \times f(R)$. $|f(R)|$ is a limited non-decreasing function of R . In the case of deterministic fractal $f(R)$ can be written as [15] $f(R) = \exp(a \sin(D_I \log R + \phi)) \simeq 1 + a \sin(D_I \log R + \phi)$, with $a \ll 1$. Therefore $f(R)$ is an oscillating function with the wave length changing proportionally to the scale R . In a random fractal, $f(R)$ has a more complex behavior, but keeps these qualitative features. By averaging over all the observers, $f(R)$ is smoothed out: $\langle f(R) \rangle_p = 1$. Note that the effect of $f(R)$ is that fluctuations in $N(< R)$ with respect to the average $\langle N(< R) \rangle_p$, are proportional to $\langle N(< R) \rangle_p$ itself, rather than to its square root as in a poissonian distribution. Let us now consider the two-point conditional density $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle_p$. Blumenthal & Ball [17] have shown that statistical translation and rotational invariance, together with scale-invariance, lead to

$$\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle_p \simeq \Gamma(r_1)\Gamma(r_2)\mathcal{L}(r_1/r_2, \theta), \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(r_1/r_2, \theta) = 1 + g(r_1/r_2, \theta)$, with $\lim_{r_1/r_2 \rightarrow 0, r_2/r_1 \rightarrow 0} g(r_1/r_2, \theta) = 0$, is called *lacunarity* function.

By using Eq. (1), one obtains the average count in a VL sample:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p &= \frac{4\pi B}{D} R^D \times \int_{L_{VL}}^{\infty} \phi(L) dL \\ \langle N^2(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p - \langle N(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p^2 &\sim \langle N(< R; > L_{VL}) \rangle_p^2 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

on large enough scales, when shot noise becomes negligible. Then, we expect that fluctuation from a single observer in spatial counts with respect to the average are of the same order of the average itself at any scale. Analogously, applying Eq. (2) to this case, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N(> f) \rangle_p &= AB\mathcal{Q}(L_*, \delta) f^{-\frac{D}{2}} \\ \langle N^2(> f) \rangle_p - \langle N(> f) \rangle_p^2 &= A^2 B^2 \mathcal{Q}_2(L_*, \delta) f^{-D} \sim \langle N(> f) \rangle_p^2, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(L_*, \delta) &= (1/(D(4\pi)^{\frac{D-2}{2}})) L_*^{\delta + \frac{D+2}{2}} \Gamma_e \left(\delta + \frac{D+2}{2} \right) \\ \left\{ \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_2(L_*, \delta) &= (L_*)^{2\delta+2+D} \int_0^\infty dx_1 dx_2 x_1^\delta x_2^\delta e^{-(x_1+x_2)} \int_0^\infty dy_1 y_1^{D-1} \\ &\times \int_0^\infty dy_2 y_2^{D-1} \int_{4\pi} \int_{4\pi} d\Omega_1 d\Omega_2 g\left(\frac{y_1}{y_2}, \theta\right) \Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{x_1}{4\pi}} - y_1\right) \Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{x_2}{4\pi}} - y_2\right) \end{aligned} \right. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Eqs.(13)-(14) show the persistent character of counts fluctuations in the fractal case. In terms of apparent magnitudes the normalized fluctuation becomes $\langle \delta^2(m) \rangle_p = \mathcal{Q}_2(L_*, \delta) / [\mathcal{Q}(L_*, \delta)]^2$. This implies that counts fluctuations around the average are constant with apparent magnitude (or with distance), in contrast with the previously considered poissonian case where they are exponentially (or power law) damped. A particular attention must be paid to the case $D = 3$ in fact, from Eqs.(13)-(14), while the average counts formulas reduce to the Poissonian ones, fluctuations stay scale invariant in contrast with the Poissonian case. This is due to the assumed shape of the lacunarity function, which contains in itself the scale-invariant behavior of fluctuations. In order to obtain the real Poissonian-homogeneous case, it is not enough to consider the limit $D \rightarrow 3$, but it is necessary to substitute the relation between 2-point conditional density and 1-point conditional density with $\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle_p = \langle n(\vec{r}_1) \rangle_p \langle n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle_p$ at large enough $|\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|$, and not large enough r_1/r_2 which is a weaker condition.

Let us now consider a mixed case in which the system is homogeneous (i.e. λ_0 is finite), but presents scale-invariant density fluctuations. This last event is in general described by the divergence of the correlation length r_c , which is usually defined as the scale beyond which $\xi(r)$ is exponentially damped. It measures up to which distance density fluctuations density are correlated. Note that while λ_0 refers to an one-point property of the system (the average density), r_c refers to a two-points property (the density-density correlation) [19, 18]. Therefore let us consider a system in which $\langle n(\vec{r}) \rangle = n_0 > 0$ and $\xi(r) = [\delta(\vec{r})]/n_0 + f(r)$, with $|f(r)| \sim r^{-\gamma}$ for $r \gg \lambda_0$, and $0 < \gamma \leq 3$. The case $\gamma > 3$ is not considered here. Indeed, since $|\int d^3r \xi(r)| < +\infty$, it is simple to show that fluctuation are at maximum Poisson-like, and in the case in which $\int d^3r \xi(r) = 0$, they can be also smaller. Moreover, this case corresponds to a scale-invariant fluctuation density field with “negative” dimension.

We recall that in the definition of l -point conditional densities the contribution of the origin of coordinates is not considered. Therefore $\langle n(\vec{r}) \rangle_p = n_0[1 + f(r)]$. In such a situation density fluctuations around the average have a scale-invariant nature. In fact a density field $\rho(\vec{r})$, defined by $\rho(\vec{r}) = [n(\vec{r}) - n_0]$, represents a kind of fractal field whose 1-point conditional density is $n_0\xi(r) \sim r^{-\gamma}$, and $D = 3 - \gamma$ represents the fractal dimension. For the same reason the quantity $\langle (n(\vec{r}_1) - n_0)(n(\vec{r}_2) - n_0) \rangle_p = n_0^2 [\xi(r_{12}) + \zeta(r_1, r_2, r_{12})]$ is analogous to the two-point conditional density of the fractal case. Therefore one can impose the equivalent of Eq.(12) to the present case: $f(r_{12}) + \zeta(r_1, r_2, r_{12}) = f(r_1)f(r_2)\mathcal{L}(r_1/r_2, \theta)$, where θ is the angle between $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$, and $\mathcal{L}(r_1/r_2, \theta)$ is defined by Eq.(12). Therefore, from Eqs. (3),(4), we can write

$$\langle n(\vec{r}_1)n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle_p - \langle n(\vec{r}_1) \rangle_p \langle n(\vec{r}_2) \rangle_p = n_0\delta(\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2) + n_0^2 f(r_1)f(r_2)g(r_1/r_2, \theta), \quad (16)$$

where the term in $\delta(\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2)$ is due to the diagonal part of $\xi(r_{12})$. As shown below, this term is important only for $\gamma \geq 3/2$ (i.e. $D \leq 3/2$ if $\gamma > 0$). In the case of a fractal point distribution this contribution was omitted because in that case it is always irrelevant. At this point we can evaluate counts fluctuations around the average both in a spatial (redshift) VL sample (for large R) and a flux limited one (for small f). First of all, we obtain (considering only the main contribution): $\langle N(<R; >L_{VL}) \rangle_p \sim R^3$ and $\langle N(>f) \rangle_p \sim f^{-\frac{3}{2}}$. Moreover, if $\gamma < 3/2$, we have $\langle \delta_{VL}^2(R) \rangle_p \sim R^{-2\gamma}$ and $\langle \delta^2(f) \rangle_p \sim f^\gamma$, while if $\gamma \geq 3/2$ the contribution from $\delta(\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2)$ in Eq.(16) dominates, and the same result as in the Poissonian case is obtained. Finally in terms of magnitude one find: $\langle \delta^2(m) \rangle_p \sim 10^{-0.4\gamma m}$ for $\gamma < 3/2$ and $\langle \delta^2(m) \rangle_p \sim 10^{-0.6m}$ for $\gamma \geq 3/2$. Therefore also in the case of a *homogeneous*, but correlated point distribution, normalized counts fluctuations around the average must be always damped, no matter the large scale behavior of the correlation function. We have only a distinction of damping rate between the two cases $\gamma \geq 3/2$ (which includes also the case of an exponentially tailed $\xi(r)$) and $\gamma < 3/2$. In the first case, because of the fast decay of

$\xi(r)$ at large scales, the behavior is the same as in the poissonian case without correlations; in the second case the damping of normalized fluctuations is slower as correlations become important. We conclude that the only case in which persistent and scale invariant normalized counts fluctuations can be observed, is the case of a fractal point distribution. Note that this behavior can be observed also in the case when the point distribution is homogeneous, but we are analyzing sample smaller than the homogeneity scale λ_0 .

We have considered the average and fluctuations of the counts in the low redshift approximation. The effect of the cosmological corrections (G: geometrical, K: k-corrections, E: luminosity evolution correction) are, in the range $0.1 \lesssim z \lesssim 1$ linear with redshift. Such corrections, which are mostly model dependent, can change the slope of the average counts determined from a single point (i.e. The Earth). For example we have discussed the effect of K+G corrections in the determination of the slope of the counts as a function of distance from one point in [20]. A similar effect can also occur in number counts as a function of magnitude in the equivalent regime (e.g. $15^m \lesssim B \lesssim 20^m$). However it is worth to note that the presence of possible persistent and scale-invariant fluctuations in the counts cannot be due to any smooth correction to data as cosmological and evolution effects, but they can be the outcome exclusively of the strongly correlated effects present in a fractal point distribution. *In fact, smooth corrections to the average behavior cannot produce persistent scale-invariant fluctuations in the counts of the same order of the average itself.* This property suggests an important experimental check of the possible fractal nature of the galaxy distribution from the behavior of number counts as a function of apparent magnitude with the advantage of using also two dimensional surveys, rather than only redshift ones.

Acknowledgments We thank Y.V. Baryshev, R. Durrer, J.P.Eckmann, P.G. Ferreira, M. Joyce, M. Montuori and L. Pietronero for useful discussions. This work is partially supported by the EC TMR Network "Fractal structures and self-organization" ERBFMRXCT980183 and by the Swiss NSF.

REFERENCES

- [1] De Lapparent V., Geller M. & Huchra J., *Astrophys.J.*, 343, (1989) 1
- [2] Tully B. R. *Astrophys.J.* 303, (1986) 25
- [3] Peebles, P.J.E., (1980) *Large Scale Structure of the Universe*, Princeton Univ. Press
- [4] Sylos Labini F., Montuori M., Pietronero L., *Phys.Rep.*,293, (1998) 66
- [5] Pietronero L., *Physica A*, 144, (1987) 257
- [6] Joyce M., Montuori M., Sylos Labini F., *Astrophys. Journal* 514,(1999) L5
- [7] Wu K.K., Lahav O.and Rees M., *Nature*, 225, (1999) 230
- [8] Peebles P. J. E., (1993) *Principles of physical cosmology*, Princeton Univ. Press
- [9] Kerscher, M., Schmalzing, J., Buchert, T. and Wagner, H. *Astron.Astrophys* 333,(1998) 1
- [10] Picard A., *Astronomical Journal*, 102, (1991) 445
- [11] Bertin E. and Dennefeld M., *Astron.Astrophys.* 317, (1997) 43
- [12] Binggeli, B., Sandage, A., Tammann, G. A., *Astron. Astrophys. Ann. Rev.* 26, (1988) 509
- [13] W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications*, vol. 2, ed. J. Wiley & Sons, (New York 1965)
- [14] Salsaw W.C. "The distribution of galaxies" Cambridge University Press (2000)
- [15] Sornette *Physics Reports*, 297, (1998) 239
- [16] K. Falconer, *Fractal Geometry*, ed. J. Wiley & Sons (New York, 1990).
- [17] Blumenfeld R. and Ball R.C. (1993) *Phys. Rev E.*, 47, 2298
- [18] Gabrielli A., Sylos Labini F., and Durrer R. *Astrophys.J. Letters* 531, (2000) L1
- [19] Gaite J., Dominiguez A. and Perez-Mercader J. *Astrophys.J.Lett.* 522, (1999) L5
- [20] Joyce M., Montuori M., Sylos Labini F., Pietronero L., *Astron.Astrophys*, 344, (1999) 387